

So we started with a concern that Senator Warner was addressing with existing language and language that I saw that he was using to correct it that may have created a new problem. So what I'm saying we do, rather than saying the current language which says, "promote quality and effectiveness", or what the original bill proposed, "assure viability", that we say that they should assure that the governing boards promote the quality and effectiveness of programs resulting in the viability of such programs. Both sets of language are here. It's clear that the governing boards are the ones that are promoting quality and effectiveness and that the end result is a viability of such programs, although we do have some check that there is a look at quality and effectiveness. As I explain it, it sounds like maybe how many angels will dance on the head of a pin sort of language in discussion. I hope it's something beyond that. I hope it's language that will give the Coordinating Commission a clearer direction that we don't want them looking specifically at the quality of instructors but that we also want them to do things other than be bean counters and counting the number of heads that show up for classes and registration and assume that that's their only responsibility. With that, I would urge your adoption of the amendment.

SENATOR CROSBY: Thank you, Senator Withem. Senator Warner, on the Withem amendment.

SENATOR WARNER: Madam President, members of the Legislature, just briefly I would rise to support the Withem amendment as he has explained. I think we both end up with, hopefully, a clarification of a somewhat perhaps different concern but one which...which should help give direction to the commission what's intended. I do want to say that my definition for viability was one of looking at a program, not whether or not it was justified or needed for a couple of years, but whether the program could be sustained and would be needed for a longer period of time as far as the commission could look and it was consistent with a comprehensive plan. And, obviously, I don't object to the quality and effectiveness of the program being included inasmuch as this becomes a requirement of the governing boards as opposed to the Coordinating Commission per se. But I believe that, as Senator Withem has explained, why both ends are met and I would support the amendment.

SENATOR CROSBY: Thank you, Senator Warner. Any further discussion on the Withem amendment to LB 683? Seeing none,